

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 93 04:30:12 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #543
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 23 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 543

Today's Topics:

 More on Pirate Radio
 The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 93 13:20:21 EST
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: More on Pirate Radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

> Well, it seems that Jeff might be editorializing just a little. Bly
> responded to a post on alt.radio.pirate which asked "Does the FCC catch
> you?". His response was cross-posted to rec.radio.amateur.policy, so
> the alt.radio.pirate group has enjoyed a snippet of hamster policy
> rhetoric, which, frankly, should not have been cross-posted.

>

> Bly responded and said "well, I bootlegged on ham radio for five years
> and never got caught". No, Bly didn't get into some long emotional
> apology, he just said "I did it and I didn't get caught". Does he
> condone the practice? I don't know. Given that Bly is licensed
> as KA6MWT, look it up, it suggests he doesn't outright condone this
> practice anymore.

>

> Then, Mike Shoupe said some stuff, including the comment about a
> couple of 5KW Am transmitters he has. He made some comment about using
> them on amateur bands as a licensed amateur. The callsign database
> suggests he is currently a technician class licensee, but I saw
> nothing in Shoupe's post to suggest that (a) he plans to operate the
> transmitters on the ham bands without the correct license and (b)
> that he plans to operate the transmitters at the full 5KW output.

Dana,

Jeff and I disagree on a number of topics. Some of which you and I DO agree on. However, in the context of the posts that were on r.r.a.p. I have to agree with Jeff in that no remorse was implied nor reasonably inferred. Not even after the comment was made about the outlaw status. All that it would have taken was a statement that "Hey, I have my license now don't I...". However that was not the case. Flaunting outlaw status is not 'good amateur practice' in any way, shape or form. To express disgust is a common and, should be, expected response from a group of LICENSED amateurs.

>
> So, Jeff simply jumped off to some conclusions without knowing all
> of the facts.

The response was to the comments as made, no conclusion was necessary.

> Like a typical hamster cop, he convicted these people
> without a fair trial. Good P.R. for the hamster "self-policing"
> movement. Not!

A 'hamster' is a rodent. Considering the definition of rodent that applies to Pirates not to Amateurs.

>
> >No talking behind my back, now.
>
> Sure, Jeff, we'll just suspend rec.radio.amateur.policy activity
> until you get back.

I inferred a smiley. Did anyone else?

--

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org     |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----
```

```
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
-----
```

| The Brady Bill is Law. |

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1993 19:45:19 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>And the simple reason is that there is no GOOD arguement for keeping the
>code requirement on HF. So the "whiners" argument wins by default.

And the simple reason is that there are plenty of technical justifications for
keeping the code requirement on HF. So the "whiners" argument wins by default.

Boy, that REALLY resolved the issue. ;-)

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1993 19:41:38 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec22.015119.21144@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<1993Dec22.114826.15329@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2fa3ibINN4e0@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <2fa3ibINN4e0@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana
Myers) writes:

|> The issue I see is that Novices and Techs with code have HF privileges
|> now, and class B, as I understand, is the "no CW/no HF" license.

Not exactly. Class B would have 10 meters (completely) at 100 watts
plus all the existing "novice CW bands".

|> I prefer the two tier system myself, but adding a third tier to deal
|> with migration from the old system is probably the simplest solution.

I still don't understand why a 3rd tier is necessary. What does the

addition of "Class C" really solve? Perhaps you could expand on this a little more, as I'm confused.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1993 19:51:08 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Cslipaulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2f7vu2INNdtr@nighthawk.ksu.ksu.edu>,
<1993Dec22.015119.21144@anomaly.sbs.com>, <1993Dec22.114826.15329@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>I propose that all new licensees receive a sequential block D
>callsign, and be allowed to apply for an available "vanity"
>callsign in any of the blocks after one year.

Sounds good; I'd make it three years instead of one, to make sure the person occupying good call is actually likely to use it.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #543

